



Quid Novi

VOL. III. NO. 7

MCGILL UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF LAW
FACULTE DE DROIT UNIVERSITE MCGILLOctober 21, 1982
21 octobre, 1982

Opinion:

MOCK COURT, MOCK LAW

by Ian Fraser

Breakin' my yarbles tryna
get this done
I fought the law, and the
law won
I need more time an' I got
none
I fought the law, and the
law won
Lost my learned colleague
an' I feel so bad
--guess my race is run--
Wrote the best factum that I
ever had
--I fought the law and the
law won--
I fought the law, an' BA
BA BA BOOMM.
-apologies to Joe and the
lads

One week. It's not as if
it were one week to apply
real knowledge and compe-
tence to the formulation of
a few basic arguments, well-
stated and firmly grounded.
That -- even at the expense
of Labour, Contracts, etc.
--I wouldn't mind; that
seems useful experience and
a valid test of relevant
abilities. And fun be-
sides.

But I do mind the moots.
Not the oral pleading; the
factum preparations. I mind
very much having to AC-
QUIRE, in one week, the
knowledge and competence
referred to above.

I know something about

criminal law. I'm familiar
with the overall structure
and sources of at least
Civil Civil obligations.
Family law and property,
taken generally, are hardly
foreign. To these any stu-
dent has had some exposure
outside school, and, by
second year, considerable
exposure on the inside. In
these the Moot Court Board
is perfectly entitled to
presume my basic competence.

But business? Or labour?
These are specialized areas,
not only in their legal as-
pects but in their entirety.
After one week's work --
even adding a few weeks

classes in the corresponding
course, and neither of them
is compulsory -- I've
learned some legal rules and
terminology; I am still not
nearly capable of speaking
intelligently about any
issue in either area to
anyone -- let alone fit to
presume to tell anyone what
the law should be in that
area. And I resent having
to pretend I am. It's
demeaning, for one thing; I
don't like being arrogant.
More than that, I'm leery of
the effect such an assid-
uously prosecuted game is
calculated to have -- a kind
of deceit of myself and
Cont'd on p. 6

Positive Action for South Africa

by Daniel Gogek

Book Review: South Africa:
Challenge and Hope, by the South
Africa Working Party. American
Friends Service Committee, 146
pages, \$4.95.

The current crisis in South
Africa is in dire need of fresh
ideas, a greater public awareness,
and a more cohesive outside ef-
fort.

South Africa: Challenge and
Hope is a compelling source of in-

struction on the current struggle
for change. It's a first step to-
ward providing the new ideas and
proposals so badly needed.

In light of the enthusiasm law
students recently showed for di-
vestment, along with the fact that
several students proclaimed that
diversment was mere "tokenism",
this book should prove an invalu-
able resource for those students
truly concerned about carrying this
project further. Cont'd on p. 5

TEACHING: WHAT'S HAPPENING

by John Douglas Shields

It has been said that a university professor's job would be perfect if one could only get rid of the students. Such an attitude only serves to underline the extent to which teaching has been downgraded in the modern university environment.

McGill Law School, which many consider to be among the top two or three law schools in the country, is certainly not immune from this movement away from an emphasis on teaching. While the academic staff may well have an impressive list of publications, writings and conference participation to their credit, the level of teaching, it is submitted, rates very poorly. McGill Law School, with its excellent reputation for academic achievement, is resting on its laurels.

Lectures are generally non-stimulating, tiring, and repetitive. While professors are on average prepared for their lectures, there seems to be a general lack of imagination, and worst of all, interest. Too often it appears, the prof will arrive on the hour or a little after, lecture for some 55 minutes and then depart for the sanctuary of their offices, leaving the students wondering just what they got out of the lecture.

Horror stories abound: professors being assigned courses at the last moment and stating that they plan to stay "two lectures" ahead of the class; professors reading the whole lecture from the case-book while the students look on; professors who plan on leaving the faculty at the end of the year and who rush inadequately through the material with a resigned air of complete boredom; professors who refuse to answer questions; professors arriving at lectures unprepared, fumbling with notes; professors cancelling lectures with little or no notice; professors who do not really appear competent in the subject matter -- most students will know variations.

There is a complete absence of innovative or even effective teaching technique. Professors often insist on lecturing straight for their allotted time while students play stenographer. Too often, what goes in one ear.... The famous Socratic method is hardly used at all and if so, it is more often abused

than used. Teaching theory and practical experience both show that people only really learn by doing but how many profs bother to go through problems in class or apply concepts to concrete examples? Is it any wonder that practitioners, who can relate concepts to everyday problems and who are often not encumbered by massive amounts of doctrine and theory, are the most popular of professors?

One arrives as a first year student at McGill Law School with a complete absence of knowledge of the law. Each day is a challenge, an invitation to absorb and work with something new. Students fill up the first rows of seats, listen with an almost complete level of attention, eagerly volunteer answers and thoughts, readily question and then, when classes are over, often discuss these new concepts with each other in the library or the cafeteria.

During the second term, and certainly by the start of the second year, most of this keenness has vanished to be replaced by a general attitude of disinterest -- almost complete apathy. One discovers that it takes only a certain amount of work to pass, that professors only want to hear back what they themselves have said, that new ideas are often unwelcome. Students move into the back rows of the class, they begin to show up unprepared, or quite often, don't show up at all. The attitude of interest towards the law is replaced by the feeling that one is simply marking time, serving out a sentence if one wishes, until one receives the magic piece of paper that signifies release and a move away to the next step.

The challenge of first year completely fades away. How often is one seriously challenged in third and fourth years? Students come to expect to be spoonfed the course and then regurgitate it on the exam to pass. Interest is non-existent, apathy is everywhere.

Just how much of the blame that can be placed on teaching is hard to pinpoint, but surely the level of teaching is a major factor. Is it any wonder that students come unprepared to class when the prof will read cases out loud and then brief it for them, rather than spend the time discussing? How can one be anything but apathetic or cynical when one is spoonfed a course or when a course is

& WHAT ISN'T HAPPENING?

badly taught? Is it any wonder that the brightest students don't even show up at all? How many class periods are simply a waste of time?

Students are at the school to learn but do they? Law school has become an exercise in absorption and then regurgitation. The people who do the best are often those with the best memories rather than those who have the best understanding of the material.

The attitude towards teaching is visible in both the materials and the exams. Materials, especially casebooks, are often too voluminous and outdated to be of any real use. All kinds of draft legislation is examined -- how much of it will ever be passed? Exams often reflect inadequate preparation and a total lack of planning. Students are exposed to 100% exams on one topic covered in one week from a 13-week course, exams with 60% questions on one professor's article, case comments in French for a mostly anglophone class, closed book exams covering 75 cases with no case list, exams that avoid difficult areas and ask for a general essay on the subject, etc. It is all evidence of teaching that fails to make the grade.

A solution to the unhappy state of teaching at McGill and at all post-secondary education institutions would be to require professors to hold a teaching certificate -- to have taken one year of teaching theory and practice. This would at least give a professor some foundation in how to instruct, to interact with his class, to recognize problems, to set proper exams, etc. Such a solution, however, is not currently feasible. Many professors could not afford an additional year of graduate work. But surely, professors could use their vast amounts of non-teaching time to take the courses that will allow them to become more effective in the classroom. How many professors could not spare one month each summer learning how to be a better teacher? Surely, there is a professional obligation on professors to recognize that good teaching is their primary responsibility.

There appears to be a reluctance by professors to attempt to better their teaching. How many profs ask whether what they have just "taught" has been understood? How many profs do not organize class committees? How many profs have

taken time to discuss with their class what could be done to improve the course? How many profs have ever spoken candidly about their teaching, grading, marks, or even taken them to heart? There appears to be almost no dialogue between professors and their students.

To some extent, this lack of dialogue is compounded by the geo-physical layout of the law school. Professors are isolated in their offices in the old building, students are completely separate in the new building. Professors come down from their "ivory tower" and through the hallways into the new building for their lecture and then retreat to their offices as soon as the lecture is over. But, the problem is not completely physical. How many profs will stay after a class to discuss problems or issues with students? How many profs have ever had coffee with students in the cafeteria or ever eaten lunch there? If professors make themselves accessible, dialogue can only increase with the result of better courses.

One of the main problems facing the quality of teaching in post-secondary institutions is the fact that professors as a group are relatively unpoliced. Unlike professional organizations like legal and medical licensing committees which assume responsibility for the activities of their members, university professors are not subject to stringent licensing requirements and professional codes of conduct. They are in theory responsible to their chairman or dean but in practice, it is very difficult to remove a university professor for "malpractice" and almost impossible when the professor has tenure. As a result, university professors can get away with inept and unsuitable professional behaviour that would result in harsh punitive sanctions from a bar society or medical licensing board. If a lawyer badly mismanages a case or a doctor botches an operation, they are both civilly and professionally liable, often with extreme consequences. If a professor in a university writes an unfair exam, teaches a bad course, or refuses to answer questions, what are the sanctions?

Why shouldn't a law student have an adequate source of recourse with professional sanctions for a professor who inadequately teaches a course, prepares an

Quid Novi

Quid Novi is published weekly by students at the Faculty of Law of McGill University. Production is made possible by support of the Dean's office, the Law Students' Association, and by direct funding from the students. Opinions expressed are those of the author only. Contributions are published at the discretion of the editor and must indicate author or origin.

Editor-in-Chief Richard Janda
Rédacteur-en-chef

Rédactrice française Martine
French Editor Turcotte

Managing Editor Demetrios Xistris
Administrateur

News Editor Joseph Rikhof
Rédacteur

Features Editors Lynn Bailey
Collaboration Pearl Eliadis
spéciale

Associate Editor Daniel Gogek
Rédacteur adjoint

Staff Alan Alexandroff, Dan
Membres Barker, Dougal Clark,
Sidney Fisher, Rick
Goosen, Heather
Matheson, Paul Mayer,
Brian Mitchell, M. Henri
Pallard, Celia Rhea,
Diane Sokolyk, Gertie
Witte.

Quid Novi est une publication hebdomadaire assurée par les étudiants de la faculté de droit de l'université McGill. La publication est rendue possible grâce à l'appui du bureau du doyen, de l'Association des étudiants en droit ainsi que par le financement individuel des étudiants. Les opinions exprimées sont propre à l'auteur. Toute contribution n'est publiée qu'à la discrétion du comité de rédaction et doit indiquer l'auteur ou son origine.

Editorial

PAVLOVIAN POLICY

A professor mentions the word "policy" in class and our pens automatically salivate words like "state interest" and "underlying reasoning" and so on. Interesting to note that we have been trained to believe in policy only when raised by our learned professors and that, where not raised, it doesn't matter or should not be taught in "that" class.

Case in point; in a certain criminal law class last year, a student raised a valid point respecting the possible policy issues that may have been present in a case, although that line of reasoning was not articulated. After casting a contemptuous glance at the student, the professor responded: "If you want to know that, go take a criminology course". Similar comments had been made throughout last term, indicating that the little tricks and rules and games of criminal law are the *raison d'être* of the course, and any silliness dealing with policy issues was not of aid in helping us understand the "rules". I would submit that the policy considerations in play at the time of the enactment of the Criminal Code, or more generally at the time of the development of any doctrine, is fundamental to the comprehension of any branch of the law. I would further suggest, that in view of the many vital moral issues involved in fields like the criminal law, a professor who espouses the "board-game" approach has a dangerous influence on first-year students in particular, mainly because many first-year suffer from the delusion that professors are always right. (This is not meant to be a patronizing aspersion on the intelligence of first-year students, most of whom recover from the delusion admirably quickly.)

The professor might argue in defence that there is a limit to the time available in any given class and that priority must be given to certain substantive issues that have to be covered by April. It is a valid argument only when the definition of the so-called substantive issues is delineated. Rules and games are of no value to me (or, I would argue, to any thinking student) unless I know something about where they came from and why. If the curriculum of the course allows no room for response to valid questions relating to the policy behind a rule, then that course should be changed.

Pearl Eliadis

South Africa

Cont'd from p. 1

South Africa: Challenge and Hope is, above all, a handbook of suggestions for positive action. Though indeniably of pro-African leanings, the book should not be prejudged as being biased. Conclusions are reached through objective statements and analyses. Written collectively by a number of scholars and lecturers, the work is the culmination of over 25 years of extensive contact between the A.F.S. Committee and South Africa. The book itself took over two years of research and study.

The authors have not hesitated to spell out apartheid using simple stunning facts: Four and one-half million whites own 87% of the land, while twenty-two million Africans are assigned to 13% of the land.

The book also serves almost as a compendium of the long history of systematic legislation on apartheid. The Population Registration Act of 1950 ensures that every person is assigned to a social category — white, coloured, or African. The 1913 Native Lands Act denied the rights of Africans to buy white land. The 1950 Group Areas Act proclaims the strict residential segregation, one of the cornerstones of apartheid's legal and economic structure. The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 gives state control of this most intimate of relationships. And finally, though the list goes on and on, the 1953 Bantu Education Act was introduced (by Hendrik Verwoerd) with the statement: "When I have control of native education, I will reform it so that the natives will be taught from childhood to realize that equality with Europeans is not for them."

To make matters worse, the rights of women are even more curtailed. Only a quarter of African women may obtain paid employment; the others must remain on the homelands. Those women who do work are, like men, separated from their children as a condition for living and working in restricted white areas. Furthermore, women are paid less than men in virtually every occupation.

Nor have the authors spared the



IN ONE EAR AND OUT THE OTHER

grim facts of repression. When Black Consciousness leader, Steve Biko, was detained by authorities in August 1977, he was literally chained and left to die (a fact apparently not disputed by the South African government): "He was not removed from the irons for two days, by which time he was mentally confused; his hands, feet and ankles were swollen and cut; his clothes and blankets were soaked in urine. [...] He was given a mat and died on the stone floor of his cell."

In their proposals for action, the authors make it clear that the Committee wishes to see non-violent courses of action. There is perhaps a contradiction in this statement. The situations of oppression and tension in Guinea-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe all found their solutions only through armed struggle. The tension among blacks in South Africa is high; it has only been quelled recently since the banning of the

17 major Black Consciousness organizations in 1977. Whether or not change is likely to be effected in South Africa in the absence of armed struggle is an extremely difficult question.

However, there is an implicit distinction made in the book: what we can do as outsiders is not the same issue as what blacks may have to do as insiders. The positive, non-violent actions that are called for are those that we as outsiders may engage in now.

On this point, the authors are quite prolific. They envision more than the usual legally sanctioned marches, peaceful demonstrations, and selective boycotts. Actions must be more positive. We could sponsor students, support refugees, organize public education campaigns, organize our efforts to change our own foreign policy. Their list goes on and on. The point is clear. The time to act positively is now.

Mockery...

Cont'd from p. 1

avoid and, in previous academic contexts, have been rewarded for avoiding.

The first step to wisdom is recognition of ignorance, not its concealment. What what else but the concealment of ignorance is the moot program -- as presently constituted -- concerned? What is it you fear when you enter the "Court" -- that you're wrong? That you'll lose? That the policy you're advocating is ill-advised? Or, simply and crassly, that the judges will be "hard" and chop up your well-crafted but essentially abstract amalgam of out-of-context quotations, legal rules bare of background in reality, and authorities you're in no position to question?

Of course I have few worthwhile thoughts about the role of directors in corporations here or in Ontario, or in England; of course I have no contributions to make to a real understanding of the justifications for and disadvantages of picketing, in provincial or federal labour relations today or 20 years ago. But I sure as hell can make you believe I do -- that is, to the extent I do well on stage this October 19th.

Not that the things about which I complain are concealed; I've no call to say I was tricked. You'll learn to think like a lawyer, remember? Not you'll learn the law, or you'll learn how the law is and can be used, or how to decide how it should be used, or why it is what it is.

So "How DO lawyers think?" -- How did you prepare your factum? How do you study for law exams?

Is that how you believe lawyers -- good lawyers -- really do think? And should think?

YOUR WEEKLY SMILE

Dear Bora,

I am a first year law student enrolled in Constitutional law and am quite intimidated by my professor. His incredible and great capacity to raise precise points of statutory interpretation is beyond my depth. Should I drop out of law school?

Yours, Worried

Dear Aspect-doctrine-of-Pizza:

Do not drop out of law school. Not matter how precise your knowledge of statutory interpretation, there is nothing more intimidating than losing 9-0 in the Supreme Court. One of the Nine

Cont'd from p. 4

unfair exam, is unprepared for class or simply has an attitude of complete disinterest? Sure, students can complain to the professor or to the dean, but usually nothing is done. One can save one's comments for the teaching evaluation but these appear relatively useless. Often a professor will not allow publication of the evaluation (surely, there should be a professional obligation for professors to make known to the class that the evaluation will not be released before they are filled out), the evaluations are not released until after the course (which is too late to correct that year's class) and what happens when the professor is leaving the faculty anyway?

Perhaps some of the problem at McGill can be attributed to what some see as a relatively weak administration. One could not say that the administration is actively bent on achieving the highest level of education possible. How often have the Assistant Dean or the Dean sat in on classes to judge the effectiveness of a professor's teaching? How often will they meet students in the cafeteria over coffee or lunch to ask them how school is going. Two years ago, there were several "bear-pit" sessions with the Dean - they seem to have completely disappeared.

Teaching in its most basic definition, is nothing more than helping someone else to learn. Teaching at the university level is teaching at its highest level. No longer is it simply a question of imparting basic skills like reading and writing but one acts as a resource person, helping students get the best education possible. To ensure that goal, a university professor must make teaching his number-one priority. In essence, professors work for the students -- they are the students' servants. Professors are paid by the students (with help from the provincial and federal governments), and the students' best interest should come before that of the professors'. If a professor is teaching only because the profession gives him lots of free time, a chance to do research, a chance to consult with almost no overhead, etc., that professor should not have a position on faculty. A commitment to excellent and effective teaching must take precedence over all other goals. Teaching should be the most unselfish, the most altruistic profession of them all.

Students are at McGill Law School to learn - period.

Teaching at McGill Law School should be the number one priority - period.

Part II

THE SOAPS OF JUSTICE

Episode Two: The Defense Rests

by Clarence Darrow

It was in the latter part of the spring of 1971 when Queen's University Law Professor, Keith Latta, received a call from his ex-business associate in Edmonton, requesting that he push his planned visit to Alberta up by a couple of weeks. Bob Neville explained how his penchant for life in the fast lane had landed him in some hot water with a few underworld types. They were blackmailing him and he needed the benefit of his "old buddy's wisdom to help him think things through." Keith Latta obliged his ex-partner, arriving in Edmonton on June 10, 1971. Bob Neville was murdered on Sunday the 13th of June — the coroner placing his time of death at approximately four hours before the actual take-off time of Keith Latta's Air Canada flight to Toronto.

Professor Latta's statement to the police, that his planned rendez-vous with the deceased that Sunday morning had never materialized, when coupled with the finding of his palm prints on a map and locker key found near the deceased in his Jasper Avenue office, spelled immediate arrest. Within three weeks he had been indicted for noncapital murder and released on bail to return to Kingston. Two very important events would occur before the good Professor would return for trial.

Firstly, there was the matter of choosing a defence lawyer. Latta called it a "big decision": deciding between airlifting Toronto big-gun Arthur Maloney, Q.C. into Edmonton for the trial or taking what Latta so ironically referred to as the safe route — hiring Cam Steer, the blue-chip establishment lawyer from Edmonton with a minimum of experience in criminal matters. Had he bothered to examine the rather unique s.430 of the Criminal Code and its practical significance, Latta would have realized, as Edward Greenspan put it, "that a senior Ontario

lawyer in the early seventies would have twenty times the jury trial experience of his Alberta counterpart — and jury experience doesn't hurt in jury trials." I'll say.

The second key factor in the case to emerge during Latta's bail trip to Kingston, was that he had lied to Inspector LaFave of the Edmonton Police. He had been in Bob Neville's office on Sunday, June 13th, and he had seen Bob executed. In checking his ex-partner's body for a pulse that was no longer there, Latta had found a couple of calling cards which the dead man's assailant had left behind: a map of Italy, and a locker key from the bus terminal. Hoping to find some clue to the murderer's identity he raced to the terminal to discover that a pair of eyeglasses, an Italian/English dictionary, and not much else of any substance was in the locker.

His mind is racing now, needless to say, but his instincts tell him to return to the crime scene. Once there, Latta was presented with the picture of his ex-business partner still lying in the window of the travel agency in a pool of blood — and not a single cop in sight. So you call the police, right? Or do you? Remember this is your ex-business partner — the one you still have the \$75,000 double-indemnity insurance policy on. You could offer to get the police investigation off the ground by telling them that you've been called to Edmonton because mafioso types have been blackmailing him, supposedly. But then your prints are all over everything in the office (as well as the map of Italy and Canadian/Italian dictionary — uncharacteristically obvious claims of Mafia responsibility for the death, Mario Puzo's *The Godfather* would tell us later), and you're a law professor who has already been halfway across town since the murder, in an alleged impersonation of the late, great Sherlock Holmes. And if, while you're standing over the corpus defecti, you have sufficient control of the situation to

realize that you haven't been so well-framed as to make jail a likely possibility, can you predict with an equal degree of certainty that you won't be tried and convicted outside of the court system? Back in, say, the boardrooms of Kingston? No I think a quick break for the Air Canada lounge at Edmonton International would have been my instinctive reaction as well.

They call it panic and the last time I checked my Martin's they didn't send you to jail for it. So long as the other "checks and balances" in a criminal justice system are in place (theoretical) and functionally operative (practical). The right to make full answer and defence to a (criminal) charge is one such check. In the face of grilling, aggressive style Alberta Crown Prosecutor William Staynton was sure to employ, any failure to exploit that right to the hilt would likely see Latta spend a good deal of his life behind bars.

The Trial

There is a time-honoured tradition of the Criminal law which affords the defence lawyer, at the close of the Crown's case, the option of not calling any witnesses, and thereby obtaining the right to address the jury last. The advantages of this ploy are twofold: defence counsel can attack any points made by Crown Attorneys in their summations and can send the jurors off to their deliberation room with the sounds of his submissions ringing in their ears. This tactical ploy took on an added significance in this particular case, in that it was directly tied to the issue of whether or not to put Latta on the witness stand where the aggressive Mr. Staynton would no doubt not only attack Latta's version of what transpired on that bright Sunday morning in June, but also the reasons which motivated this eminent lawyer and law professor to give an entirely different account to Edmonton police Inspector LaFave, immedi-

Cont'd on p. 8

Notice From the Program Board Director:

Fellow students! I have recently been appointed to perform the duties of Program Board Director, a new position established by the LSA in order to co-ordinate the various activities in the faculty. The purpose behind the position is to prevent conflict situations such as a professors scheduling a make-up class when there is a general assembly being held at the same time, and also to extend extra-curricular activities throughout the term so as to prevent two wine and cheese parties being held in the same week. From hereon in, all professors who would like to schedule make-up classes or special classes of any kind during the time slots set aside for student activities (Wednesdays from 12:00-2:00 o'clock) must receive the PBD's authorization before being permitted to reserve a classroom at the SAO. This same policy will also apply to any group, club, student, professor, etc. who wishes to organize extra-curricular events during the allotted time slots.

The LSA has determined the following system of priorities which will be applied when there is any competition for the same time slot:

- * General assemblies will have priority over any curricular or extra-curricular activity. As there will only be two more general assemblies scheduled for this term: Wednesday, October 27th and Wednesday, November 17th, this policy is not expected to create any serious inconvenience.

- * Providing no general assembly is to be held, any curricular activity may be scheduled on Wednesdays between 12:00 and 1:00 o'clock. The authorization will be granted automatically.

- * On Wednesdays and Thursdays between 1:00 and 2:00 o'clock it is the student activities which will have priority. However, we strongly urge anyone who wants to organize an extra-curricular event to plan ahead and reserve a time slot at least 5 days prior to the date of the activity. The reason for this is that professors and BSA members will be permitted to schedule a curricular activity in these time slots by ensuring 5 days before the proposed date that no

SOAPS

Cont'd from p. 7

ately after the crime was reported. The civil lawyer from the upper crust of Edmonton society — no doubt frightened by the combination of Staynton's trial prowess and his own blatantly obvious ineptitude — coerced his tired client into forsaking his right to testify. Edward Greenspan called this "the most difficult decision a lawyer can make", noting that in practice it is indeed rare that a client who denies his guilt is not put on the stand. There is really only one inference that a jury of 12 laymen can reasonably be expected to draw from such a course of action.

If the deluge of criticism prompted by Steer's decision not to call Latta is unjustified, the same cannot be said of the senseless manner in which he handed the "right of last address to the jury" back to a surprised, but grateful, Crown prosecutor: by electing to call 5 witnesses who testified on matters of minimal or no importance to the case. Mr. Steer followed this up with a summation to the jury which all but pointed a finger at his client. Even the most cursory reading of the trial transcript gives one the distinct impression that Steer was drowning in his own sweat. It took the jury very little time to return a verdict, and there was more than a trace of regret in the trial judge's voice when he pointed out that "the law leaves me no choice, Mr. Latta, I sentence you to twenty years in prison."

extracurricular event is planned for the same day. This policy will permit flexibility in the scheduling of classes, on the one hand, while giving priority to extra-curricular activities on the other.

Please feel free to approach me to discuss the scheduling of activities. If you can't get a hold of me, you can always leave a note in my mailbox in the LSA office and I will leave the authorization there for you to pick up. With your cooperation, this system should work effectively to eliminate scheduling difficulties.

Cristina Circelli

Addendum

Even after it had unsuccessfully run the full appeal route, the Latta case refused to die. A host of subsequently revealed but inconclusive evidence points to the man's innocence. But the most credible proof that this conviction was a travesty of justice resulted from the most incredible of coincidences. The late Bob Neville really was being hunted down by mobsters, for \$30,000 in gambling debts. And it was the hired guns' arrival in Edmonton in early June of 1971 that had prompted Neville to make the fateful call which would bring an innocent man into a trap he'd not escape for the rest of his life. The wife of the jury foreman in the Latta case had accompanied Neville to Las Vegas on numerous occasions. And she was in the room when he placed the call to Kingston seeking Latta's help. Justice Minister Ron Basford, in response to a question in the House of Parliament in March of 1976, took the extremely unusual step of referring the matter to the Alberta S.C. for determination. The Court ruled that the 1976 testimony of this mysterious woman who would not come forth at trial because "she was sure Latta would get off", would not have been admissible at the latter's trial.

Today Professor Keith L.G. Latta, who committed those pardonable human sins of panicking and hiring grossly incompetent legal counsel, serves out the remainder of his twenty year sentence. His experience with the scales of justice should serve as a lesson to us all.

Paper Recycling

Beginning Monday October 18, there will be a bin in the basement of the law faculty where newspaper can be placed for recycling. At first, the recycling will be for newsprint only (that is: The/Le McGill Daily, The Gazette, Le Devoir, etc., but not Quid Novi). Recycling for other types of paper may be organized soon.

Everyone is encouraged to keep filling up the bin, thereby saving a tree and keeping the faculty a bit cleaner. Thank you. (The janitorial staff thanks you too!).

Peter Oliver